



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------|
| 09/836,271 | 04/18/2001 | Susumu Honma | 109295 | 5481 |
| 25944 | 7590 | 12/16/2003 | EXAMINER | |
| OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320 | | | HAMILTON, MONPLAISIR G | |
| | | ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | 2172 | | 12 |

DATE MAILED: 12/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | |
|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| Advisory Action | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 09/836,271 | HONMA ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Monplaisir G Hamilton | 2172 |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 12 November 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
 - (a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: ____.

3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-15.


Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. Other: _____.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant has essentially argued that Rheaume does not disclose a data input form, i.e. a form in which data can be input form, examiner holds that the HTML file disclosed by Rheaume is a data input form that accepts input in a certain form. For example a web designer can enter information into the HTML table according to the table layout specified. Therefore, Examiner holds that the HTML and the table data extracted to build a relational database is equivalent to the claimed data input form and database defining means based on the data contained within the HTML file. Applicants claim does not sufficiently distinguish the claimed input form, from the disclosed HTML file. The formatted data contained in both the form and HTML file are used to generate a database. Moreover, In response to applicant's argument that Rheaume and Tamano are nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the two references are pertinent to same problem, constructing a database using information contained in an input form. Examiner holds that the form disclosed by Tamano, the HTML table disclosed by Rheaume, and the table/form disclosed by applicant are equivalent. As disclosed by Applicant's Fig. 2, the table is essentially a form, therefore in view of this disclosure examiner asserts that the entities disclosed by Tamano, Rheaume and applicant are used to define a database, using the information contained within. Therefore, examiner holds that the claimed invention is unpatentable in view of the disclosures of Rheaume and Tamano.



ATTORNEY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100